



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,304	03/10/2004	Daryl R. Kipke	65306-0100 (2522)	4415
10/291 7590 03/05/2008 RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC 39533 WOODWARD AVENUE SUITE 140 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-0610				
EXAMINER				
ERIZO, DARWIN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3773				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/797,304

Applicant(s)

KIPKE ET AL.

Examiner

Darwin P. Erez

Art Unit

3773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/12/05 8/4/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/12/05 and 8/04/06 have been received and made of record. Note the acknowledged form PTO-1449 enclosed herewith.

Drawings

2. Color photographs and color drawings are not accepted unless a petition filed under 37 CFR 1.84(a)(2) is granted. Any such petition must be accompanied by the appropriate fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h), three sets of color drawings or color photographs, as appropriate, and, unless already present, an amendment to include the following language as the first paragraph of the brief description of the drawings section of the specification:

The patent or application file contains at least one drawing executed in color. Copies of this patent or patent application publication with color drawing(s) will be provided by the Office upon request and payment of the necessary fee.

Color photographs will be accepted if the conditions for accepting color drawings and black and white photographs have been satisfied. See 37 CFR 1.84(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,366,326 to Barry et al.

(claim 1) Barry discloses a method of sealing the site of a neurosurgical procedure (col. 2, ll. 30-43) comprising the steps of: applying a purified alginate solution to a site of a neurosurgical procedure and adding a calcium chloride solution to form a polymer (col. 3, ll. 39-45).

(claims 3, 5 and 6) Barry discloses the site to be the central nervous system, more specifically to the spinal cord of a human being(col. 2, ll. 32).

(claims 7 and 8) Barry discloses the alginate solution to have a molecular weight of 1,000 to 3,000,000 daltons (or 1,000 to 3,000,000 g/mol), which covers the range recited by the applicant . Barry also discloses the concentration to be about 0.1% to 4%, which covers the range recited by the applicant (col. 4, ll. 52-57).

(claim 10) Barry discloses the additional use of drugs (col. 6, ll. 53-55).

(claim 11) Barry discloses the use of 2% calcium chloride (col. 6, ll. 14).

(claim 12) See the rejection to claim 1. The addition of an alginate solution and calcium chloride to form a polymer would provide a visual location of the site of the neurosurgical procedure.

(claim 14) See the rejection to claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 2, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., as applied to the rejection to claims 1 and 12 above, and in further view of US 5,433,739 to Sluijter et a.

(claims 2 and 13) Barry discloses all the limitations of the claim, including the neurosurgical procedure being a laminectomy procedure. Barry is silent with regards to the neurosurgical procedure comprising the implantation of a neural probe. However, Sluijter discloses that the insertion of a neural probe is common during a laminectomy procedure (col. 13, ll. 15-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the step of implanting a neural probe to the methodology of Barry because it is known in the art to implant a neural probe during a laminectomy procedure, as taught by Sluijter.

(claims 15 and 16) See the rejection to claim 1. The formation of a polymer formed from alginate solution and calcium chloride would inherently stabilize the neural probe. The site of the neurosurgical procedure is the central nervous system.

8. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., as applied to claim 1 above.

(claim 4) Barry discloses all the limitations of the claim except for the site being the brain. Barry does disclose the site being the spinal cord. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the methodology of Barry to treat the brain during a neurosurgical procedure since both the brain and the spinal cord are both part of the central nervous system and that the use of a known technique to treat similar sites would provide predictable results. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007).

(claim 9) Barry discloses the use of guluronic acid content alginate (col. 4, ll. 3) but is silent with regards to the viscosity range. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the alginate in a viscosity of 20 mPas to about 200 mPas since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darwin P. Erez whose telephone number is (571)272-4695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Darwin P. Erez/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773